

## Message Text

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 STATE 202483

60

ORIGIN EUR-12

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 SS-15 PM-04 CIAE-00 DODE-00 H-02 INR-07

L-03 NSAE-00 NSC-05 PA-01 PRS-01 SP-02 USIA-06

ACDA-05 TRSE-00 SAJ-01 OIC-02 CU-02 SAM-01 /070 R

DRAFTED BY EUR/RPM:DSKINNEY  
APPROVED BY EUR:JGLOWENSTEIN  
C:JDOBBINS  
PM/ISD:COL. MASSON  
OASD/ISA:T. WILKSNSON  
DOD/JCS:FWILSON  
DOD/JS/J-5:  
S/S: FVORTIZ

----- 071020

P R 260031Z AUG 75  
FM SECSTATE WASHDC  
TO USMISSION NATO PRIORITY  
AMEMBASSY BONN PRIORITY  
USCINCEUR  
INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS  
USNMR SHAPE  
USLOSACLANT

C O N F I D E N T I A L STATE 202483

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: NATO, CSCE, PARM, PFOR

SUBJECT: CSCE/CBMS: IMPLEMENTATION OF CBMS ON  
OBSERVERS

REF: A. STATE 188451 DTG 090001Z AUG 75  
B. STATE 192319 DTG 132331Z AUG 75  
C. NATO 4385 DTG 191820Z AUG 75  
D. BONN 13675 DTG 2213L3Z AUG 75

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 STATE 202483

1. GUIDANCE FOLLOWS FOR YOUR USE IN DISCUSSIONS ON

IMPLEMENTATION OF CONFIDENCE-BUILDING MEASURE (CBMS) ON INVITATION OF OBSERVERS TO MAJOR MILITARY MANEUVERS UNDER THE FINAL ACT OF THE CSCE. DISCUSSIONS AT NATO ON THE QUESTION OF IMPLEMENTATION, AND WITH FRG IN BONN ON THE SPECIFIC QUESTION OF INVITATIONS TO OBSERVERS FOR REFORGER SHOULD DRAW ON THESE IDEAS BUT EMPHASIZE THAT THEY ARE SUBJECT TO ALLIED CONSENSUS- OUR MAJOR INTEREST AT THIS JUNCTURE IS THAT OBSERVER CBMS BE IMPLEMENTED PROMPTLY AND IN THE SPIRIT OF THE CSCE FINAL ACT. WE DO NOT CONSIDER THAT EARLY ACTIONS NEED CREATE BINDING PRECEDENTS BUT THAT PROCEDURES IN THIS AREA WILL EVOLVE WITH EXPERIENCE. AS IN THE CASE OF THE CBM ON NOTIFICATION, IT IS NEVERTHELESS IMPORTANT THAT NATO SET HIGH STANDARDS AGAINST WHICH TO HOLD THE WARSAW PACT.

2. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN NOTIFICATION AND OBSERVER CBMS: WHILE THE FINAL ACT DOES NOT DIRECTLY LINK THE NOTIFICATION AND OBSERVER CBMS, WE AGREE WITH USNATO THAT NOT ALL NOTIFIED MANEUVERS NEED BE OBSERVED BUT THAT OBSERVERS FOR CBM PURPOSES WOULD NORMALLY ONLY BE INVITED TO NOTIFIED MANEUVERS. INVITATIONS FOR OBSERVERS SHOULD EITHER FOLLOW NOTIFICATION OR BE CONVEYED CONCURRENTLY WITH NOTIFICATION. WE AGREE THAT TWO-STEP INVITATIONS WOULD NEED TO BE FOLLOWED THROUGH EXPEDITIOUSLY, BUT DO NOT BELIEVE THIS CONCEPT IS IMPRACTICAL. ONLY THE INITIAL INVITATION TO SEND OBSERVERS NEED BE BY FORMAL CHANNELS. CONDITIONS OF OBSERVER PARTICIPATION COULD THEN BE CONVEYED INFORMALLY THROUGH LATER WORKING-LEVEL EXCHANGES.

3. SPECIFICATION OF NUMBER AND TYPE OF OBSERVERS: SPECIFICATION OF "NUMBER" OF OBSERVERS IN INVITATION IS DESIGNED TO ALLOW THE INVITING STATE ITS PREROGATIVE UNDER CSCE FINAL ACT TO CONTROL THIS VARIABLE. ALLIED UNDERSTANDING ON A STANDARD SIZE FOR OBSERVER DELEGATIONS IS NOT AS IMPORTANT AS NEED TO INITIATE PROGRESS IN THIS FIELD. THE WORD "TYPE" IN US DRAFT NOTE WAS INTENDED TO ACCOMMODATE SUGGESTIONS THAT INVITING STATE MIGHT WISH TO MAKE WITH REGARD TO BRANCH OF SERVICE, RANK, ETC., OF CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 STATE 202483

OBSERVERS, SO AS TO FACILITATE PROTOCOL AND OTHER ARRANGEMENTS. WITH REGARD TO TENTATIVE FRG VIEW THAT WARSAW PACT STATES SHOULD BE ENCOURAGED TO DESIGNATE CIVILIAN REPRESENTATIVES PRESENTLY ACCREDITED TO BONN AS OBSERVERS FOR REFORGER, HOWEVER, WE FIND THIS IDEA RESTRICTIVE, AND BELIEVE IT SHOULD NOT BECOME GENERAL PRACTICE. ON OTHER HAND, WE RECOGNIZE BONN'S DIPLOMATIC DIFFICULTIES IN CASE OF OBSERVERS FOR REFORGER AND WILL

NATURALLY SEEK TO ACCOMMODATE THEM IN PRACTICAL WAYS.

4. ISSUANCE OF INVITATION: WE ENVISION TWO ALTERNATIVE FORMULAS FOR CONSIDERATION. AS POINTED OUT REF A, WE SEE THE MERITS OF JOINT US-FRG INVITATIONS FOR REFORGER, BUT LIKE BONN WE ARE FLEXIBLE ON THIS POINT. ALTERNATIVELY, SOVEREIGNTY MAY BE THE DETERMINING PRINCIPLE AND INVITATIONS WOULD BE ISSUED BY COUNTRY (COUNTRIES) IN WHOSE TERRITORY MANEUVER TAKES PLACE.

5. STATES TO BE INVITED: FOR REFORGER EXERCISE, WE BELIEVE US/GERMAN FORMULA NOW UNDERDISCUSSION (3 WP COUNTRIES, 3 NEUTRALS, AND 3 ALLIES) HAS ADVANTAGE OF SYMMETRY AND PROVIDES FOR PARTICIPATION BY A NUMBER OF THE MORE IMPORTANT CSCE SIGNATORIES. HOWEVER, WE ARE

OPEN TO FURTHER SUGGESTIONS FROM OTHER ALLIES ON OBSERVERS AT REFORGER, IN PARTICULAR FROM CANADA AND FRANCE WHO WILL ALSO PROVIDE PARTICIPATING FORCE ELEMENTS. WE CONCUR WITH FRG THAT USSR NEED NOT BE EXCLUDED FROM INVITATION TO REFORGER, ASSUMING THAT INVITATIONS WILL BE EXTENDED TO MORE THAN ONE WP STATE.

6. UK COMMENT ON FLEXIBILITY: FOR SECURITY OR OTHER REASONS, ALLIES MAY NOT WISH SOME MANEUVERS OR PARTS OF MANEUVERS TO BE OBSERVED. ALSO IT IS UNDERSTOOD THAT THE RESPONSIBLE ALLIED STATE HAS THE PREROGATIVE OF DETERMINING THE PROCEDURES FOR HANDLING OBSERVER" AND OF PRESCRIBING THEIR ITINERARY AND ACTIVITIES.

7. FOR BONN: IN FURTHER DISCUSSION WITH RUTH, YOU MAY  
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 04 STATE 202483

DRAW ON FOREGOING AND, WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO CONVERSATION REPORTED BONN'S 13675, YOU SHOULD COMMENT THAT:

-- WE CAN APPRECIATE THE GERMAN REASONING THAT ALLIES NEED NOT BE FORMALLY INVITED AS CBM OBSERVERS TO MANEUVERS WHICH THEY CAN OBSERVE AS MEMBERS OF NATO. HOWEVER, THE FINAL ACT OF THE CSCE DRAWS NO ALLIANCE OR BLOC DISTINCTIONS. WE WOULD BE INTERESTED IN REACTIONS OF OTHER ALLIES ON THIS POINT SHOULD FRG PURSUE THIS MATTER IN NATO, AND HAVE NO OBJECTION TO RAISING THE QUESTION WITH OTHER ALLIES.

-- WE BELIEVE IT IS UNLIKELY THAT THE USSR WOULD INVITE OBSERVERS TO MANEUVERS WHICH ARE NOT SUBJECT TO NOTI-

FICATION. WHILE IT IS CONCEIVABLE THAT THE USSR WOULD INVITE OBSERVERS TO MA;EUVERS OUTSIDE THE 250-KILOMETER BORDER ZONE WITHIN WHICH THEY ARE EXPECTED TO NOTIFY UNDER THE CSCE FINAL ACT, IT SHOULD BE CLEAR THAT FAILURE TO DO SO WOULD NOT CONSTITUTE A BREACH OF CSCE OBLIGATIONS.

8. FOR USCINCEUR: US-FRG MILITARY DISCUSSIONS: WE CONCUR WITH FRG COMMENT THAT A BILATERAL MILITARY CHANNEL SHOULD BE SET UP FOR DETAILED PLANNING FOR OBSERVERS AT REFORGER, AND WOULD APPRECIATE SUGGESTIONS OF USCINCEUR FOR SETTING UP SUCH A CHANNEL. INGERSOLL

CONFIDENTIAL

NNN

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** X  
**Capture Date:** 01 JAN 1994  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** COLLECTIVE SECURITY, MEETING OBSERVERS, INVITATIONS  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 26 AUG 1975  
**Decaption Date:** 01 JAN 1960  
**Decaption Note:**  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Authority:** ElyME  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1975STATE202483  
**Document Source:** CORE  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** DSKINNEY  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** GS  
**Errors:** N/A  
**Film Number:** D750294-0232  
**From:** STATE  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1975/newtext/t19750817/aaaaaoqt.tel  
**Line Count:** 180  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM  
**Office:** ORIGIN EUR  
**Original Classification:** CONFIDENTIAL  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 4  
**Previous Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Previous Classification:** CONFIDENTIAL  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Reference:** 75 STATE 188451, 75 STATE 192319, 75 NATO BRUSSELS 4385, 75 BONN 13675  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Authority:** ElyME  
**Review Comment:** n/a  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 21 APR 2003  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review History:** RELEASED <21 APR 2003 by CunninFX>; APPROVED <17 OCT 2003 by ElyME>  
**Review Markings:**

Margaret P. Grafeld  
Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
06 JUL 2006

**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Referrals:** n/a  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** CSCE/CBMS: IMPLEMENTATION OF CBMS ON OBSERVERS  
**TAGS:** PARM, PFOR, GE, NATO, CSCE  
**To:** NATO BRUSSELS USCINCEUR  
**Type:** TE  
**Markings:** Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 06 JUL 2006